

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

John Walker,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
vs.)	Civil Action No.: 0:08-cv-00241-TLW
)	
Jon Ozmint, Director SCDC, Warden)	
of McCormick Correctional Institution,)	
)	
Respondents.)	
_____)	

ORDER

Petitioner, John Walker (“petitioner”), brought this civil action, *pro se*, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 2254. (Doc. #1). The respondents filed a motion for summary judgment on March 31, 2008. (Doc. #10). The petitioner filed a response in opposition to the respondents’ motion on April 25, 2008. (Doc. #14). On August 18, 2008, United States Magistrate Judge George C. Kosko issued a Report and Recommendation recommending that the petition be dismissed on statute of limitations grounds. (Doc. #16). This Court issued an Order on January 28, 2009, remanding this case to the Magistrate Judge for further consideration on the merits. (Doc. #22).

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by United States Magistrate Judge Joseph R. McCrorey to whom this case had previously been assigned. (Doc. #24). In the Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the District Court grant the respondents’ motion for summary judgment. (Doc. #24). The petitioner filed objections to the report. (Doc. #26). In conducting this review, the Court applies the following standard:

The magistrate judge makes only a recommendation to the Court, to which any party

may file written objections...The Court is not bound by the recommendation of the magistrate judge but, instead, retains responsibility for the final determination. The Court is required to make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. However, the Court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which no objections are addressed. While the level of scrutiny entailed by the Court's review of the Report thus depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, the Court is free, after review, to accept, reject, or modify any of the magistrate judge's findings or recommendations.

Wallace v. Housing Auth. of the City of Columbia, 791 F. Supp. 137, 138 (D.S.C. 1992)

(citations omitted).

In light of the standard set forth in Wallace, the Court has reviewed, de novo, the Report and the objections. After careful review of the Report and objections thereto, the Court **ACCEPTS** the Report. (Doc. #24). Therefore, for the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the respondents' motion for summary judgment is **GRANTED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Terry L. Wooten
United States District Judge

March 18, 2009
Florence, South Carolina